



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,145	02/27/2002	Colin J. Meiser	BOC9-2001-0041 (286)	1254
40/987 7590 10/01/2008 AKERMAN SENTERFITT P. O. BOX 3188 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188				
EXAMINER NGUYEN, TAN D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3689				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/01/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/085,145

Applicant(s)

MEISER ET AL.

Examiner

Tan Dean D. Nguyen

Art Unit

3689

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 8, 10-18, 20, 21 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 8, 10-18, 20, 21 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/18/08 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

The amendment of 6/18/08 has been entered.

Claim Status

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10 (method), 11-13 (system), and 14-18, 20-21 and 23 (computer-readable storage) are pending and rejected as below. Claims 6, 9, 19 and 22 have been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10, 14-18, 20-21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As of 6/18/08, claim 1 is as followed:

1. (Currently Amended) A method of dynamically modifying an electronic campaign comprising:
 - a) identifying available network capacity of a combined packet-switched and circuit- switched network comprising a plurality of distinct delivery channels, including at least one private network channel for communicating with a private network device, at least one telephonic channel for communicating with telephonic device, and at least one public network channel for communicating with a public Web site,
 - b) transmitting electronic content for the electronic campaign over the plurality of delivery channels of the network according to a predetermined outbound transmission flow rate for said electronic campaign;
 - c) receiving consumer responses associated with each of the plurality of delivery channels used to transmit the electronic content;
 - d) analyzing the received consumer responses and determining an effectiveness of the electronic campaign over each of said plurality of delivery channels;
 - e) selectively redirecting at least a portion of the electronic content from delivery channels determined to be less effective to t-he a delivery channel determined to be more effective; and
 - f) dynamically modifying said outbound transmission flow rate for said electronic campaign according to said determined effectiveness of the electronic campaign and said identified available network capacity.

1) In claim 1, step (b), it's not clear where the e-content are transmitted to?

2) Similarly, independent claim 14, which has the same limitation (step (b) as in independent method claim 1 above, is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claim 1 above.

Note: for convenience, letters (a)-(f) are added to the beginning of each step.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10 (method), 11-13 (system¹), 14-18, 20-21 and 23 (product) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (1) D'EON et al in view of (2) JOHNSON et al, (3) applicant admitted prior art (AAPA) or RAKOSHITZ et al and (4) SCHLACK.

As for claim independent method claim 1, D'EON et al discloses a method of assessing effectiveness of an Internet marketing (advertising) campaign (including eliciting a response) comprising the steps of:

(a) identifying the available network capacity for transmitting electronic content for an electronic campaign_and receiving consumer responses to said transmitted electronic content, and wherein the network comprising a plurality of delivery channels, including at least one private network channel, and at least one public network channel; {inherently included in the teachings of Fig. 1, 10, see col. 2, lines 6-20 "... *single proxy server.... thousands of individual user computers...*"}

(b) transmitting the electronic content over at least one delivery channel of the network {see col. 1, "*web page banner advertisement*" } according to a predetermined campaign;

(c.) concurrently determining the effectiveness of the campaign by identifying consumer responses to the transmitted electronic content (information) {see col. 2, lines 29-32, col. 3, lines 10-16, col. 7, lines 10-14 "*indication ... effectiveness of the advertisement* ", Fig. 2, Fig. 6}; and

(f) dynamically modifying the campaign parameters for said electronic campaign according to said determined effectiveness of the electronic according to said determined effectiveness of the electronic campaign and said identified available network capacity. {see col. 1, lines 50-55, and Fig. 6}).

Note that on col. 1, lines 25-31, D'EON et al teaches that Internet advertising expands space and more resources are spent on advertising and it's desirable to assess the effectiveness of Internet advertising, to more efficiently allocate Internet advertising resources. On col. 1, lines 50-55, D'EON et al teaches the step of *"ascertaining which banners are and are not effective in causing a user to make a transactional decision"*, therefore, it would have been obvious to improve (modify) the campaign effectiveness by deleting the not effective banners and use only the effective banner in order to be profitable, i.e. increasing AD #1 while decreasing or deleting AD #2, as shown in Fig. 6.

As for the additional limitation of a "at least one telephonic channel for communicating with telephonic device" in (a), as shown on col. 1, lines 12-63, D'EON discloses that Web commerce activities, or advertisements on the Web are becoming more commonplace for business transaction and communication, the use of traditional communication system such as telephonic or VOIP as delivery channel would have been obvious to a skilled artisan as mere using other well known communication system to achieve similar results. Alternatively, the function "Media blitz" is well known function in advertising and would have been obvious to apply all available communication medias such as telephone, television, newspapers, etc. to inform/reach out to all

consumers about the campaign. Moreover, the claim in step (b) only calls for "...over at least one (or 1) delivery channel of the network...", therefore, the teaching of over the Internet network in D'EON as shown on col. 2, lines 10-20, Fig. 1 is sufficient.

As for the limitation of "according to a predetermined outbound transmission flow rate for said electronic campaign" in step (b), this is inherently included in Fig. 6, see Output, element 58, "AD #: 1, 2, 3", "# IMPRESSIONS: 3, 3, 1".

D'EON et al fairly teaches the claimed invention except for: (1) explicitly disclosing that the campaign parameter in step (d) is an "outbound transmission flow rate", which is one of the many e-marketing campaign parameters, (2) new amended steps (d)-(e) above.

JOHNSON et al is cited to teach the management of a marketing campaign by monitoring consumer's activities/responses to campaigns' advertising or sales information from a distinct plurality of delivery channels (or resources) such as private network channel, public network channel, telephonic channel, telemarket channel, and other channel and monitoring the consumer's responses for sales opportunities {see Figs. 3, elements (302), (304), (306), and (308), Figs. 6, 16, cols. 4, lines 20-50 "Lead generation component 102", cols. 10-11. It would have been obvious to modify the delivery/receiving channel in the marketing campaign management of D'EON et al by including plurality of distinct delivery/receiving channels of JOHNSON et al as indicated above to fully integrated sales automation and used in a maximally efficient manner by all portions of the marketing system to which information is relevant to make an intelligent sale or "lead Generation" {see col. 3, lines 50-60}.,

AAPA, as shown on pages 1-2, discloses in monitoring e-marketing campaign, one has to monitor the campaign parameters such as normal day-to-day traffic flow such as the rate (amount of traffic /hr) of sending of promotional content (outbound transmission flow rate) as well as the receipt of customer inquiries (inbound) responsive to the e-marketing campaign to avoid exceeding the available bandwidth of the network over which the campaign is conducted. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify the teachings of D'EON et al/JOHNSON et al by changing the e-marketing campaign monitoring parameter using outbound transmission flow rate as taught by AAPA as mere using other well known e-marketing campaign parameter to more efficiently allocate Internet resources. For example, in view of the teachings of Fig. 6 of D'EON et al, it would have been obvious to reduce the outbound transmission flow rate of ads or promotional content to AD #2 or increase the outbound transmission flow rate of ads or promotional content to AD #1 as taught by AAPA.

RAKOSHITZ et al is cited to teach management or monitoring traffic flow on the Internet by monitoring, modifying or controlling the inbound and outbound information flow rate based upon application, source address, destination address, URL, time of day, day of week, day of month, other variations using traffic management tool 208 of Fig. 1 {see col. 10, lines 12-35}. Traffic management tool 208 also controls activities ranging from bandwidth/latency control to capacity planning {see lines 20-22}. It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of monitoring traffic flow of D'EON et al/JOHNSON et al by modifying or controlling one parameter of traffic flow which is the outbound information flow rate based upon a specific application (i.e. marketing

campaign) as taught by RAKOSHITZ et al as mere using other parameter for monitoring traffic flow as taught by RAKOSHITZ et al.

The teachings of D'EON et al/JOHNSON et al /AAPA or RAKOSHITZ et al fails to teach the redirecting a portion of the electronic content to a more effective channel and modifying the campaign to make it more effective.

In a system and method for monitoring consumer's activities and directing/redirecting at least a portion of electronic content (market segments/ads) to the most appropriate delivery channel, **SCHLACK** fairly teaches the concept of monitoring the consumer's activities (or request or responses) associated with each of the plurality of delivery channels used to transmit the electronic content and based upon the received consumer responses analyzed, determining which of the plurality of delivery channels is more effective than each of the other of said plurality of delivery channels and selectively redirecting at least a portion of the electronic content from other of said plurality of delivery channels to the delivery channel determined to be more effective or best suitable or appropriate to the consumer {see col. 6, lines 41-67, col. 7, lines 1-35, col. 8, lines 10-52, col. 11, lines 20-57, col. 10, lines 49-59, col. col. 12, lines 10-67, Figs. 1, 2, 7, 8 and 9}.

It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of D'EON et al /JOHNSON et al/ AAPA or RAKOSHITZ et al by including steps (d) and (e) as taught by SCHLACK to present the most suitable electronic content to the consumer, thus being more effective. Note, that the essential issue is present the most suitable electronic content to the consumer and how this is carried out, by selecting the appropriate channel among the

many channels or by selecting the appropriate content among the many contents is within the knowledge of the skill artisan. Alternatively, in view of the teaching of “selecting the appropriate e-content to present to the customer”, it would have been obvious to select the appropriate delivery channel to present the appropriate e-content to the consumer to be effective.

As for dep. claim 2 (part of 1 above), which deals with the type of electronic content or information, i.e. marketing campaign such as advertising, this is non-essential to the scope of the claimed invention and is taught in D'EON et al Fig. 1 or JOHNSON et al Figs. 4, or SCHLACK col. 2, lines 60-67, col. 9, lines 5-50.

As for dep. claims 3-4 (part of 1 above), which deals with determining available network capacity parameters, i.e. bandwidth, these are taught in D'EON et al /JOHNSON et al /AAPA as cited on pages 1-2 of AAPA or D'EON et al /RAKOSHITZ et al as shown on RAKOSHITZ et al col. 10, lines 20-60, col. 11, lines 1-45.

As for dep. claims 5, 10 (part of 1 above), which deal with marketing campaign parameters, i.e. determining a number of received consumer responses, this is taught in D'EON et al Figs. 3-6.

As for dep. claims 7-8 (part of 1 above), which deal with electronic content transmitting parameters and controlling the flow rate parameters, i.e. decreasing or increasing the flow rate, etc., these are fairly taught in D'EON et al as mentioned in the rejections of claim 1 above and/or by RAKOSHITZ et al col. 10, lines 20-35.

As for independent program product claim 14, which the respective computer program product to carry out the independent method of claim 1 above, it's rejected over the computer program product of D'EON et al /JOHNSON et al /AAPA/SCHLACK or D'EON et al / RAKOSHITZ et al/SCHLACK as indicated in D'EON et al col. 3, lines 17-35 and further in view of AAPA or RAKOSHITZ et al.

As for dep. claims 15-23 (part of 14 above), which have similar limitations as in dep. claims 2-5, 7-8, and 10 respectively above, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of dep. claims 2-5, 7-8, and 10 above.

As for independent system claim 11, which the respective system to carry out the method of claim 1 above, it's rejected over the system of D'EON et al /JOHNSON et al /AAPA /SCHLACK or D'EON et al /RAKOSHITZ et al/SCHLACK as indicated in D'EON et al Fig. 1, 2, and further in view of RAKOSHITZ et al Figs. 1-2.

As for dep. claims 12-13 (part of 11 above), which have similar limitations as in dep. claims 7, 3 respectively above, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of dep. claims 7, 3, above.

7. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10 (method), 11-13 (system¹), 14-18, 20-21 and 23 (product) are rejected (2nd time) under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (1) ORACLE iMARKETING in view of (2) JOHNSON et al, (3) RAKOSHITZ et al and (4) SCHLACK.

As for independent method claim 1, ORACLE iMARKETING discloses a method of eliciting response in an electronic (Internet) marketing campaign (advertising) comprising the steps of:

(b) transmitting the electronic content {see page 2, “web page banner advertisement”} over the network according to a predetermined campaign;

(c.) concurrently determining the effectiveness of the campaign by identifying consumer responses to the transmitted electronic content (information) {see page 2, 3rd paragraph “ROI measurement and ... effectiveness is critical”}; and

(d) dynamically modifying the campaign according to (1) the determined effectiveness of the campaign (or (c.) page 2, 3rd paragraph, page 3, 3rd paragraph, page 4, 3rd paragraph, page 5, last two paragraphs.

ORACLE iMARKETING fairly teaches the claimed invention except for step (a), (d), (e) and (f) using multiple distinct delivery channels and with modifying the outbound transmission flow rate for the electronic campaign

JOHNSON et al is cited to teach the management of a marketing campaign by monitoring consumer's activities/responses to campaigns' advertising or sales information from a distinct plurality of delivery channels (or resources) such as private network channel, public network channel, telephonic channel, telemarket channel, and other channel and monitoring the consumer's responses for sales opportunities {see Figs. 3, elements (302), (304), (306), and (308), Figs. 6, 16, cols. 4, lines 20-50 “Lead generation component 102”, cols. 10-11. It would have been obvious to modify the delivery/receiving channel in the marketing campaign management of ORACLE

iMARKETING by including plurality of distinct delivery/receiving channels of JOHNSON et al as indicated above to fully integrated sales automation and used in a maximally efficient manner by all portions of the marketing system to which information is relevant to make an intelligent sale or "lead Generation" {see col. 3, lines 50-60},.

RAKOSHITZ et al is cited to teach a method and apparatus for conducting a specific application comprising the steps of:

(a) identifying the available network capacity for carrying out the specific application,

(d) determining real-time analysis of results to enable quick relocation of resources to successful campaigns such as controlling and deploying modifying/changing the outbound transmission flow rate for the specific application to match network growth or changing needs in a growing office {see Figs. 1-2, col. 10, lines 12-36}.

It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of ORACLE iMarketing/JOHNSON et al by carrying out steps (a) and (d) as taught by RAKOSHITZ et al to provide optimal recommendations of network configurations application to match network growth or changing needs in a growing office {see Figs. 1-2, col. 10, lines 12-36}.

The teachings of SCHLACK is cited above. It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of ORACLE iMARKETING /JOHNSON et al /RAKOSHITZ et al by including steps (d) and (e) as taught by SCHLACK to present the most suitable electronic content to the consumer, thus being more effective. Note, that the essential

issue is present the most suitable electronic content to the consumer and how this is carried out, by selecting the appropriate channel among the many channels or by selecting the appropriate content among the many contents is within the knowledge of the skill artisan. Alternatively, in view of the teaching of "selecting the appropriate e-content to present to the customer", it would have been obvious to select the appropriate delivery channel to present the appropriate e-content to the consumer to be effective.

As for dep. claims 2-5, 7-8 and 10 (part of 1 above), they are rejected for the same reasons set forth above in view of the teachings by RAKOSHITZ et al.

As for independent program product claim 14, which the respective computer program product to carry out the method of claim 1 above, it's rejected over the computer program product of ORACLE iMARKETING /JOHNSON et al/ RAKOSHITZ et al/SCHLACK.

As for dep. claims 15-23 (part of 14 above), which have similar limitations as in dep. claims 2-5, 7-8 and 10 respectively above, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of dep. claims 2-5, 7-8 and 10 above.

As for independent system claim 11, which the respective system to carry out the method of claim 1 above, it's rejected over the system of ORACLE iMARKETING / JOHNSON et al /RAKOSHITZ et al/SCHLACK as indicated in ORACLE iMARKETING page 1 or RAKOSHITZ et al Figs. 1-2.

As for dep. claims 12-13 (part of 11 above), which have similar limitations as in dep. claims 7, 3 respectively above, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of dep. claims 7 and 3 above.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 6/18/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

1) Applicant's comment with respect to the teaching of the amended language for "plurality of distinct delivery channels" are noted, but they are not found persuasive in view of the cited rejections above as shown in the rejection of claim 1. As for the additional limitation of a "at least one telephonic channel for communicating with telephonic device" in (a), this appears to be taught in JOHNSON et al or on col. 1, lines 12-63, D'EON discloses that Web commerce activities, or advertisements on the Web are becoming more commonplace for business transaction and communication, the use of traditional communication system such as telephonic or VOIP as delivery channel would have been obvious to a skilled artisan as mere using other well known communication system to achieve similar results. Alternatively, the function "Media blitz" is well known function in advertising and would have been obvious to apply all available communication medias such as telephone, television, newspapers, etc. to inform/reach out to all consumers about the campaign. Moreover, the claim in step (b) only calls for "...over at least one (or 1) delivery channel of the network...", therefore,

the teaching of over the Internet network in D'EON as shown on col. 2, lines 10-20, Fig. 1 is sufficient.

2) As for the comment that the "delivery channels" of SCHLACK deal with television service network environment and not computer network as claimed, this is not found persuasive because SCHLACK is cited to teach the concept of monitoring the consumer's activities (or request or responses) associated with each of the plurality of delivery channels used to transmit the electronic content and based upon the received consumer responses analyzed, determining which of the plurality of delivery channels is more effective than each of the other of said plurality of delivery channels and selectively redirecting at least a portion of the electronic content from other of said plurality of delivery channels to the delivery channel determined to be more effective or best suitable or appropriate to the consumer {see col. 6, lines 41-67, col. 7, lines 1-35, col. 8, lines 10-52, col. 11, lines 20-57, col. 10, lines 49-59, col. col. 12, lines 10-67, Figs. 1, 2, 7, 8 and 9}. It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of D'EON et al /JOHNSON et al /AAPA or RAKOSHITZ et al by including steps (d) and (e) as taught by SCHLACK to present the most suitable electronic content to the consumer, thus being more effective. Note, that the essential issue is present the most suitable electronic content to the consumer and how this is carried out, by selecting the appropriate channel among the many channels or by selecting the appropriate content among the many contents is within the knowledge of the skill artisan. Alternatively, in view of the teaching of "selecting the appropriate e-content to present to the customer", it would have been obvious to select the appropriate delivery channel to present the appropriate

e-content to the consumer to be effective. As for the difference in the digital communication medium or environment, i.e. computer network environment and television service network environment, first of all, they both deal with digital communication environment, and secondly, the difference is non-essential to a skilled artisan in view of the scope of monitoring consumer's activities/responses in a campaign and would have been obvious to use or apply the function/step of number of delivery channel to any digital communication environment.

No claims are allowed.

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1) US 2002/0049816 discloses the monitoring, accessing and receiving of consumer data from various sources in a marketing campaign, see Figs. 1a, 1b and would have been obvious to apply this concept in the current rejection if needed.

3. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct@uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

In receiving an Office Action, it becomes apparent that certain documents are missing, e. g. copies of references, Forms PTO 1449, PTO-892, etc., requests for copies should be directed to Tech Center 3600 Customer Service at (571) 272-3600, or e-mail CustomerService3600@uspto.gov.

Any inquiry concerning the merits of the examination of the application should be directed to Dean Tan Nguyen at telephone number (571) 272-6806. My work schedule is normally Monday through Friday from 6:30 am - 4:00 pm. I am scheduled to be off every other Friday.

Should I be unavailable during my normal working hours, my supervisor Janice Mooneyham can be reached at (571) 272-6805.

The main FAX phone numbers for formal communications concerning this application are (571) 273-8300. My personal Fax is (571) 273-6806. Informal communications may be made, following a telephone call to the examiner, by an informal FAX number to be given.

/Tan Dean D. Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3689